-tu̓t, and more on Okanagan transitive forms
A working paper
Anthony Mattina
University of Montana
and
The En'owkin Centre

0. Introduction
1. Notes on transitive stems

0. Introduction. In one form or another, the contents of this paper will be incorporated in a reference grammar of Colville-Okanagan now in preparation. The flow of ongoing discussions with other members of the Salish scholarly community, most notably N. Mattina, S. Thomason, B. Carlson, and S. Egesdal, has determined the contents and organization of this paper. I do not recapitulate the outline of my view of the Colville-Okanagan transitive system, but I refer readers to the works listed as references.[1]

1.1. -nt vs. -t̓t. -nt and -t̓t stems contrast as follows. The -nt stem contains (besides the ergative subject) a direct object:

1.

a. mˤáwntxʷ   b. kʷu wíkəntxʷ
   mˤaw -nt -∅   -xʷ   kʷu   wik   -nt -xʷ
   break -nt obj   subj   obj   see   -nt subj
   You broke it.   You saw me.[2]

The -t̓t stem contains a (newly introduced) reference to a third entity (one, subject; two, object) that now functions as a (possessed) direct object, while what was the object person marker in the -nt stem, now is relegated to the role of possessor:

2.

a. kʷu mˤáw-t̓t-xʷ inlpˤát.   b. kʷu wik-t̓t-xʷ isqʷsfʔ.
   kʷu   mˤaw -t̓t   -xʷ   in-   lpˤat   kʷu   wik   -t̓t   -xʷ   i-   sqʷsfʔ
   possr break -t̓t subj   my   cup   possr see   -t̓t   subj   myson
   You broke my cup.   You saw my son.

[2] kʷu 'me, us' (with attendant allomorphy to distinguish 1st sg from 1st plural object) is the proclitic object marker of the set. Other object markers are suffixes that occur in the slot between transitivizer (-nt, -st, -t̓t, -x(í)t, -tú̓t) and subject markers.

I note now that while there is a sense in which the morphosyntax of -*łt* stems shows three participants, the requirement that possessor and possessed must be co-referential, in effect maintains the bivalence of the stem with an ergative subject and a direct object. I will return to this point presently.

Hundreds, if not thousands, of examples confirm the productivity of -*nt* and -*łt*:

3.

a. síws-ənt-xʷ iʔ lkapí.
   You drank the coffee.

b. kʷu síw-łt-xʷ in-lkapí.
   You drank my coffee.

c. ʕʼác'əntxʷ.
   You looked at it.

d. kʷu ʕʼac'-łt i-sc-k'ʷúl'.
   Look at my work!

e. náqʷ'ʷ+m-ənt-xʷ iʔ sqlaw'.[3]
   You stole the money.

f. kʷu náqʷ'ʷ+m-łt-xʷ in-kəwáp.
   You stole my horse.

g. wísxən-(n)t-xʷ iʔ yqʼip.
   You lengthened the belt.

h. kʷu wísxən-łt-xʷ in-yqʼíp.
   You lengthened my belt.

i. kʷu siw-nt-xʷ.
   You asked me.

j. kʷu siw-łt-s i-sqʷsíʔ.
   He asked my son.

k. kʷʷín-(nt)-ən iʔ atmupíl.
   I tried the car.

l. kʷu kʷʷin-łt-s in-atmupíl.
   He tried out my car.

m. q'əy'-nt-ín i-skʷíst.
   I wrote my name.

n. kʷu q'əy'-łt-íkʷ i-skʷíst.
   Write my name!

o. ʕacá-nt.
   Tie it!

p. kʷu ʕac-łt-íkʷ in-q'a'ʔxán.
   Tie my shoe!

q. səp'á-nt.
   Hit it!

r. kʷu səp'-łt-íkʷ in-pumín.
   Hit my drum!

s. c'əx̌ʷc'x̌ʷá-nt.
   Discipline him!

t. kʷu c'əx̌ʷc'əx̌ʷ-łt-íkʷ i-sqʷsqʷsíʔ.
   Discipline my child!

u. txt'a-nt!
   Take care of it!

v. kʷu txət'-łt-ik i-cítxʷ.
   Take care of my house!

w. nłk'-ənt.
   Cut it!

x. kʷu nłk'-əłt isλ'a'ʔcínəm iʔ síp'iʔ-s.
   Cut my deer hide!

y. c'q'a-nt.
   Hit it!

z. c'q'áłtis iʔ stúmxəns iʔ t xəl'míns.
   She hit his big toe with his/her axe.

Fitting the pattern first outlined, a stem like ʔam-t 'feed' has

4.

a. kʷu ʔamtís.

kʷu	ʔam	-t	-ís
obj	feed	-nt	subj

   He fed me.

b. kʷu ʔamłtís isqʷsíʔ.

kʷu	ʔam	-łt	-ís	i-	sqʷsíʔ
possr	feed	-łt	subj	my	son

   He fed my son.

1.2. -*túłt*. Unlike the transitivizer -*łt*, which allows the introduction into the sentence of a possessed direct object with concomitant relegation of the direct object marker to the role of possessor, a third transitivizer morpheme, -*tułt*, marks the introduction into the sentence of a new direct object, with the concomitant demotion of the object person marker to indirect object:

5. kʷu ʔamtúłts iʔ síyaʔ.

kʷu	ʔam	-túłt	-s	iʔ	síyaʔ
obj	feed	-tułt	subj	the	saskatoons

   He fed me the saskatoons.

Note that the only possible interpretation of (the grammatical)

6. kʷu ʔamtúłts isqʷsíʔ.

kʷu	ʔam	-túłt	-s	i-	sqʷsíʔ
iobj	feed	-tułt	subj	my	son

   He fed me my son.

is that of the gloss, 'he fed my son to me.' Note also that -*tułt* not only excludes the readings of coreferential object marker and possessive affix, it also allows for any possessed form:

7. kʷu ʔamtúłts asíyaʔ.

kʷu	ʔam	-túłt	-s	a-síyaʔ
obj	feed	-tułt	subj	your-saskatoons

   He fed me your saskatoons. DD

Three pairs of -*łt* and -*tułt* stems will further examplify the contrast:

---

[3]The symbol + marks a morpheme boundary that is irrelevant to the current discussion or exemplification.

8. kʷu siwɬts isqʷsíʔ iʔ skʷísts.

   kʷu   siw   -ɬt -s i-   sqʷsíʔ iʔ skʷíst -s

   me   ask   -ɬt he my   son   art name -his

   He asked my son what his name is. DD

9. kʷu sutúɬts isqʷsíʔ iʔ skʷísts.

   kʷu   su   -túɬt -s i-   sqʷsíʔ iʔ skʷíst -s

   me   ask   -túɬt he my   son art name -his

   He asked me what my son's name is. DD

10.

a. kʷu síqʼəɬts islíp'.

   kʷu   síqʼ -əɬt   -s i-   slíp'

   me   split -ɬt   he my wood

   He split my wood.

b. kʷu səqʼtúɬts iʔ slip'.

   kʷu səqʼ -túɬt -s iʔ slip'

   me split -túɬt he art wood

   He split wood for me.

11.   kʷu qʷəlqʷíɬts isqʷsíʔ iʔ k'əl scənqʼaʔɬsc.

      kʷu   qʷəlqʷíl -ɬt   -s i-   sqʷsíʔ iʔ k'əl scənqʼaʔɬs -c

      me   talk   -túɬt   he my   son art about business   -his

      He talked to my son about his business. DD

12.   kʷu qʷəlqʷəltúɬts iʔ scənqʼaʔɬsc.

      kʷu   qʷəlqʷəl -túɬt -s iʔ   scənqʼaʔɬs -c

      me   talk   -túɬt   he art   business   -his

      He talked to me about his business. DD

In the last two examples one can see the treatment of *scənqʼaʔɬsc*, once as an adjunct with the preposition *k'əl*, and once as the direct object argument, without preposition.

1.3. Problems with the interpretation of -ɬt stems.

1.3.1. Ambiguous -ɬt stems.
Some verb stems pose some problem of analysis, for example stems like *cu-nt* 'say to' and *m'ay'-nt* 'tell about'. These have direct objects too, no matter what the underlying thematic roles of the arguments of the verbs might be. These two forms may best be glossed as indicated in parentheses:

13.

a. cúntsən

   cú   -nt -s   -ən

   say -nt obj subj

   I said to you. (I informed you.)

b. kʷu m'ay'ntís

   kʷu m'ay' -nt -ís

   obj   tell   -nt subj

   He told about me. (He discussed me.)

But whatever the details of the semantics mapped by these -*nt* stems, the correspondent -*ɬt* stems differ from the -*nt* stems as other such stems do: what was the direct object in the -*nt* stem is now a possessor, while reference is added to a possessed object, with concomitant relegation of the object person marker to the role of possessor:

14.

a. kʷu cuɬts isqʷsíʔ.

   kʷu cu   -ɬt -s   i   -sqʷsíʔ.

   possr tell -ɬt subj my son

   He told my son RA, AA

b. kʷu m'ay'ɬtís isqʷsíʔ.

   kʷu m'ay' -ɬt -ís   i   -sqʷsíʔ.

   possr tell   -ɬt subj my son

   He told my son about it. DD

Complications are introduced by the following facts: An utterance like *kʷu cuɬts isqʷsíʔ.*[4] can be also taken to mean as 'My son told me', though the best account of this interpretation is that the utterance is heard as a fancying up[5] of

15.   kʷu cus isqʷsíʔ.

      kʷu   cu   -nt -s   i-   sqʷsíʔ.

      obj   tell -nt subj my son

      My son told me.

The utterance *ixíʔ kʷu‿m'ay'ɬtís isqʷsíʔ.* taken to mean 'My son told me about it.' can also be seen as a hypercorrection of

16.   kʷu m'ay'ntís isqʷsíʔ.

      kʷu   m'ay' -nt -ís   i-   sqʷsíʔ.

      obj   tell   -nt subj my son

      My son told me.

Similarly *cúɬtsən asqʷsíʔ.* 'I told your son.' DD, analyzed

---

[4] In the transcription of texts we (the members of the Okanagan Language Group of the En'owkin Centre) use the ligature to link clitics with their mother words. I dispense with the symbol in the numbered examples of this paper.

[5] In motivation not unlike that of such English patterns as 'they invited Carl, Jane, and myself;' 'they invited Jane and I.' 'Myself' and 'I' sound more formal than 'me.'

17. cúłtsən asqʷsíʔ.

    cú   -łt -s   -ən a-   sqʷsíʔ
    tell -łt obj subj your son
    I told your son.

is (correctly) translated 'I told it to your son,' while by itself, *cú-łt-s-ən*, without an expressed argument, is interpreted as 'I told it to you' (a hypercorrection of *cúntsən*). *kʷu̲cúłts* is interpreted as 'He told it to me,' a hypercorrection of *kʷu̲cus*:

18. kʷu cus.

    kʷu   cu   -nt -s
    obj   tell -nt subj
    He told it to me.

1.3.2. Bases[6] without -nt stems. The interpretation of the object referents of *-łt* forms as indirect objects (and not possessors) is encouraged by a couple of bases[7] that have *-łt* and *-xit* stems, but no *-nt* stems. These are *xʷíc'* 'give,' and *kʼł+xʷíc'* 'send.' Thus we have *xʷíc'łt, xʷíc'xt*, but **xʷíc'-nt*. With these transitive stems the object referents are regularly interpreted as the recipients (and the difference between the *-łt* and *-xit* stem is also the expected one, as explained in section 1.4.):

19.

a. haʔ kʷu aksxʷíc'łtəm? McG
   Are you going to give it to me?
   (something definite, e.g.
   the one in your hand)

b. haʔ kʷu aksxʷíc'xtəm? McG
   Are you going to give things to me?
   (something indefinite)

c. kʷu xʷíc'əłts iʔ slʼaẋts iʔ sqlaw's.
   He gave me his friend's money.

d. kʷu xʷíc'xts t sqlaw'.
   He gave me some money.

In other words, *xʷíc'-łt* and *xʷíc'-xt* are best glossed 'give something to someone,' while the stem *xʷíc'+x+m-nt*[8] is best glossed 'give something away.' In the former stems the object referent is the recipient, and in the latter stem the object referent is the goal.

---

[6]A base consists of a root (two in compounds) with or without some other morphological material immaterial to the stem. Otherwise stated, a base is a stem minus the derivational affix in question. See N. Mattina 1994 for discussion.

[7]There may be a few more bases with the same limitation.

[8]For examples of forms of this stem and related discussion see examples 23-25.

1.3.3. Stems without indirect objects. With stems that do not tolerate indirect objects, *-tułt* forms are interpreted as having a second object, possessed by the object, but not legitimately (the difference seems to be, as in the examples I give here, that between *my gun* and *the gun I have*):

20. t'iʔ cənʔúłxʷ pit, uł uktúłts iʔ tətw'ít iʔ st'ət'q'ánaʔks.
    As soon as Pete came in, he saw the gun that the boy had (not necessarily the boy's gun)

21. łə nʔułxʷ pit, uł way' cmistís iʔ tətw'it, uktúłtəm iʔ st'ət'q'ánaʔks.
    When Pete came in, the boy knew that Pete had seen the gun he (the boy) had

22. kən łaʔ nʔułxʷ, cmistís iʔ tətw'it way' uktúłtən iʔ st'ət'q'ánaʔks.
    When I went in, the boy knew that I had seen the gun he had.

1.4. -łt vs. -x(t)t. Whereas *-łt* stems make reference to a possessed, hence definite direct object, *-x(t)t* forms make reference to indefinite direct objects. Default indefinite direct objects are either (1) plain indefinite forms–simple nouns without possessive or unrealized affixes, or (2) possessed unrealized ones–nouns marked with the future prefix *kł-* and a possessive affix. Here are some sets of examples to demonstrate the contrast:

23. caʔkʷ kʷu cxʷic'łtxʷ ismán'xʷ.

    caʔkʷ   kʷu c-   xʷic' -łt -xʷ i-smán'xʷ
    should me cisl- give -łt you   my-smoke
    Please give me my smokes.

24. kʷu cxʷic'xt iʔ t lkalát.

    kʷu c-   xʷic' -xt iʔ t lkalát
    me   cisl give -xt art t bread
    Give me some bread.

25. n'ín'w'iʔs xʷic'xtmən t akłlkapí. RA

    n'ín'w'iʔs   xʷic' -xt -m -n t a-   kł- lkapí
    if_and_when   give -xt you I t your fut coffee
    I'll eventually give you some coffee. (I plan to ...)

26. way' kaʔkícłtsən anq'aʔxán.

    way' kaʔkíc -łt -s -ən an- q'aʔxán
    yes find   -łt you I   your shoes
    I found your shoes.

27. kaʔkícxtmən t akłq'aʔxán.

    kaʔkíc -xt -m -ən t a-   kł- q'aʔxán
    find   -xt you I   t your fut shoes
    I found you some shoes.

28. lut kʷu aksnáqʷ’ʷmɬtəm inkəwáp.

    lut   kʷu   a-   ks-   náqʷ’ʷ+m -ɬt -əm   in-   kəwáp

    not   me   your fut   steal   -ɬt -m[9]   my   horse

    Don't steal my horse from me.

29. lut kʷu aksnáqʷ’ʷxtəm t ikɬkəwáp.

    lut   kʷu   a-   ks-   náqʷ’ʷ   -xt -əm   t   i-   kɬ-   kəwáp

    not   me   your fut   steal   -ɬt -m   t   my   fur   horse

    Don't steal a horse for me.

2. Notes preliminary to the discussion of stems extended with -min. Before I discuss stems extended with -min, I survey briefly the function of word-final -m (as opposed to stem-forming -m), that summarizes how I classify these affixes. Implicit in this presentation is the fact that I do not try to conflate these morphs into smaller sets of morphemes.

2.1. -m 3rd person switched (passive) subject. This morpheme, cognate with -m 'passive' / 'indefinite subject' of related languages marks a *switched passive subject*, that is, a third person singular subject that is co-referential with (the same as) the subject (usually active) of the preceding clause. If expressed, the agent phrase requires t‿ Contrast the following:

30. cənʔútxʷ pit, uɬ wiks iʔ sqʷsfʔs.

    cənʔútxʷ   pit,   uɬ   wik-∅-s   iʔ   sqʷsfʔ-s

    come_in Pete_j   and   saw-him_k-he_j art   son_k-his_j

    Pete came in, and saw his son.

31. cənʔútxʷ pit, uɬ wíkəntəm iʔ t sqʷsfʔs.

    cənʔútxʷ   pit,   uɬ   wíkənt-əm   iʔ   t   sqʷsfʔ-s

    come_in Pete_j   and   saw-he_k   art   t   son_k-his_j

    Pete came in, and his son saw him.

Note the reading of a sentence with wik-ɬt:

32. cənʔútxʷ pit, uɬ wikɬts iʔ sqʷsfʔs.

    cənʔútxʷ   pit,   uɬ   wikɬt-∅-s   iʔ   sqʷsfʔ-s

    come_in Pete_j   and   saw-him_k-he_j art son_l-his_k

    Pete_j came in, and he_j saw his_k son_l.

---

[9]See section 2.3.1. for a discussion of this -m.

and note -m '3rd person switched passive subject' with -ɬt:

33. cənʔútxʷ pit, uɬ wíkɬtəm iʔ t tətw'ít iʔ st'ət'q'ánaʔks.

    Pete came in and the boy saw [Pete]'s pistol.

34. cənʔútxʷ pit, uɬ wíkɬts iʔ tətw'ít iʔ st'ət'q'ánaʔks.

    Pete came in and saw the boy's pistol.

Note the use of *cu-s / cú-nt-əm* in an exchange which includes examples of two intransitive forms (*cut* and *scuts*) which serve to break the pattern active subject + goal / switched passive subject + actor:

35. cus iʔ‿ɬkəɬmfɬxʷs: "xʷuyx, ƛ’ʔant iʔ‿sfya?.

    He said to his wife: "Go get the saskatoons.

    cúntəm "c'sap iʔ‿sfya?."

    She said to him "the saskatoons are all gone."

    itfʔ ɬcúntəm iʔ‿ɬ‿sqəl'tmfxʷs: "kʷa? ta‿sp'fk'əm mi kʷ‿cƛ’ʔám."

    Then her husband said to her: "Then get some bitterroot."

    cus iʔ‿sqəl'tmfxʷs: "kʷ‿iscúnəm ta? unfxʷ kʷu‿sc'əspcfnx."

    She said to her husband: "I told you, we really are out of grub."

    cut iʔ‿sqəl'tmfxʷ: "caʔkʷ lut kʷ‿ɬa?‿ct'iyám t‿sqipc, ʕapná? caʔkʷ kʷu‿xʷaʔst'fk'əl."

    The man said: "If you hadn't been lazy last spring, now we'd have lots of grub."

    (ɬ)cúntəm (iʔ‿ɬ‿ɬkəɬmfɬxʷs): "kʷa? way' nixʷ q'sápi? ki? c'sap iʔ sɬfqʷtət.

    (His wife) said to him: "Heck, it's also been a while since our meat supply ended.

    ʕ’ant anwí nixʷ kʷ‿ɬa?‿ct'iyám, uɬ lut kʷu‿ɬ’a ksɬiqʷ."

    Look, you too were lazy, and we don't have any meat."

    iʔ sqəl'tmfxʷ ixfʔ scuts, "mat atfʔ kʷu‿ɬk'asasfləm kʷu‿st'it'imúlaʔx."

    The man then said, "I guess we are both lazy."

I note finally that (1) isolated sentences like

36. wik-∅-s   pit

    saw-him-he Pete

can be interpreted with *pit* as either subject or object, but the natural reading has *pit* the object; and (2) that the elicitation of renderings of sentences like *Mary saw him*, and *Mary saw Pete* mimic the English syntax but should not be taken as prototypes of Okanagan sentences:

37.
a. marí   wik-∅-s
   Mary saw-him-she

b. marí   wik-∅-s   pit
   Mary saw-him-she Pete

2.2. *kʷu...-m* 3rd subject - 1st pl object. Together these two affixes signal what I have glossed, *kʷu* 1st plural object; -*m* 3rd subject.

38.   kʷu cúntəm iʔ tətw'ít.
      kʷu cú-nt-əm iʔ tətw'ít
      us   tell-nt-he art boy
      The boy told us.

The subject phrase is grammatical without ⌐, ungrammatical with it, and this sets apart -*m* 'passive' from this -*m* 'third subject with 1st pl object:'

      *kʷu cú-nt-əm iʔ t tətw'ít.

kʷu cúntəm iʔ tətw'ít 'The boy told us.' parallels

39.   kʷu cus iʔ tətw'ít.
      kʷu cu-s iʔ tətw'ít
      me   tell-he art boy
      The boy told me.

with -*m* and -*s* marking the subject. Note that, as my gloss suggests, -*m* is singular and plural. *kʷu cúntməlx iʔ tuʔtw'ít* is ungrammatical, whereas *cúntəm* and *cúntməlx* contrast as exemplified:

40.
a. cúntəm iʔ t tətw'ít.
   The boy told him.

b. cúntəməlx iʔ t tətw'ít.
   The boy told them.

2.3. -*m* 'intransitivizer/middle'
2.3.1 -*m* intransitivizer. This is added to all transitive stems (which then become intransitive) in the genitive paradigm of person inflection[10], typified by such forms as

---

[10]I explain this in my working paper on Okanagan aspect markers (A. Mattina 1993). One should keep in mind that -*nt* has allomorph -*∅* in the singular or intransitivized forms.

41.
a. a-ks-wík-əm
   you will see him

b. a-ks-wík-ɬt-əm
   you will see his ...

Note that by itself *a-ks-wík-əm* (or any such form) is not a complete sentence, showing the nominal nature of the construction. The following, however, is a complete sentence:

43.   ixíʔ akswíkəm.
      ixíʔ a-ks-wík-əm
      that you-fut-see-intr
      You'll see him/that.

kʷu a-ks-wík-əm 'you'll see me' is also a complete sentence (parallel to *kʷu anʔíw* 'I'm your father'), though in practice some supporting material usually accompanies it, as in

44.   way' kʷu akswíkəm.
      You'll see me.

From a distributional point of view, I see nothing to prevent one from conflating the -*m* of genitive paradigms with -*m* middle, discussed next.

2.3.2. -*m* middle. The -*m* I subsume here, cognates of which are sometimes labeled 'antipassive,' seems to perform two functions. The first is to intransitivize a base that, presumably, is felt to be inherently transitive. In order to be conjugated with the absolutive (intransitive) person referents, such a base must receive -*m*. Thus *kʷul'*, felt to be inherently transitive (cf. *kʷúl-ant-x* 'you fixed it'), takes -*m* in the absolutive paradigm:

45.   kən k'ʷúl'əm
      I worked, I fixed/did something.

With basically intransitive bases, the situation is as follows. Such verb bases do not take -*m*, and, for example, *xʷuy*, felt to be inherently intransitive, conjugates without -*m* in the absolutive (simple completive) paradigm:

46.   kən xʷuy
      I went.

Noun bases take nothing in equational constructions

47. kən sqəltmíxʷ
    I am a man.

and (this is the second function of this morpheme) add -m to derive verb forms:

48. kən lasmíst-əm[11]
    I put my shirt on.

These verb forms, somewhat like the parallel English derivations, have a meaning related to that of the noun, but probably not predictable (see 'table a motion,' 'chair a committee,' 'handle a situation,' etc.).

2.3.3. Notes on the interpretation of -m stems. N. Mattina has made an interesting observation, that I present here, leaving to her the broad interpretation of these and related facts. In a sentences like kən_ɬˁapám ɬsx̌'aʔcínəm 'I shot/killed a deer.' the verbal predicate is the middle stem ɬˁapám (in the 1st sing. form) with an adjunct corresponding to the notional object. But a stem like txam 'comb one's own hair' does not participate in a sentence where the notional object can be expressed with a t phrase. A t prase forced on such a verbal predicate has either an instrumental reading

49. kən txam t sx̌əx̌c'íʔ.[12] McG
    I combed my hair with a stick.

or calls for an interpretation of txam as 'comb something:'

50. kən txam t qəpqíntən iʔ təl' sənkɬmútən. McG
    I combed some hair off the chair.

Forms such as kən_txam are parallel to forms with lexical suffixes, for example,

51. kən kc'awʔíw'səm.
    I washed my face.

---

[11]Note that -m is the head of lasmístəm, and -m makes the construction a middle verb; -m is also the head of kʷúləm, and -m makes the construction a middle verb. In a construction like clasmíst 'he has his shirt on,' c- is the head of clasmíst, and c- marks the construction an intransitive verb in the customary/actual aspect.

[12]This construction seems less natural than sx̌əx̌c'íʔ intaxmín 'My comb is a stick.' See also packɬ inqʷácqən 'I'm using a leaf for a hat / my hat is a leaf.' corresponding to kən_qʷácqnəm ɬpackɬ. (example 53b).

with middle interpretation ('do X to one's own ...'), while the corresponding transitive stems show a non-reflexive object as in tx-nt 'comb someone's hair:'

52.
a. kən c'awʔíw'kstəm.   b. c'awʔíw'ksəntxʷ.
   I washed my hands.   You washed his hands.

c. kən txam   d. txəntín
   I combed my hair.   I combed his hair.

t phrases with these verbal predicates are construed as instrumental, as

53.
a. kən kc'awʔíw'səm t siwɬkʷ. MT   b. kən qʷácqnəm t packɬ.[13] McG, MT
   I washed my face with water.   I used a leaf for a hat.

Occasionally speakers vacillate and disagree on whether or not -m is required in a given stem (usually with stems extended by other morphological material), and this does not seems an abnormal linguistic phenomenon.[14] But while speakers are uncertain about adding -m to certain bases, as we have seen, there are two other sets of stems each defined by its behavior in the simple intransitive completive paradigm: (1) stems of one set lack a contrast between a form with -m and a bare one; and (2) stems of the other set show such a contrast. This suggests a diagnostic for class membership of verbs or nouns: nouns and transitive verbs derive middle verbs with -m; intransitive verbs do not have a middle form. A corollary is that all complex transitive verb forms undergo -m suffixation when conjugated with the genitive referent set (see Aspect paper for details; see section 2.3.1. for comments on distribution).

54. kən xʷuy (xʷuy = intransitive verb base)
    I went
    *kən xʷuym

55. kən k'ʷúl'əm (t) ... (k'ʷul' = transitive verb base)
    I worked/fixed ...
    *kən k'ʷul' t ... (but kən_k'ʷul'l' (t) ... 'I was born;' 'I turn to ...')

---

[13]Cf. footnote 9.

[14]The simplest examples are of the kind luɬ_aksanɬípt(əm) 'don't forget (it),' where the occurrences of the parenthesized elements correlate (see also examples 82-83). Cases like kən_ʔíɬn(-əm) ɬstiqʷ. 'I ate some meat.' also occur, and here the -m does not necessarily correlate with the expressed object. The vacillation between luɬ aksanɬíptəm and luɬ aksanɬíptəmnəm shows -min+nt (transitive stem) plus intransitivizer -m.

56. kən náq'ʷəm (t) ... (*naqʷ* = transitive verb base)
I stole ...
*kən naq'ʷ

57.
a. kən qʷácqən. (*qʷácqən* = noun base)   b. kən qʷácqnəm.
I'm a hat.   I put a hat on.

3. -*min*.

3.1. Preliminaries. I keep -*m* 'middle' separate from the -*m* that, added to *kʷul'* (see example 55) derives a transitive stem *kʷul'-m-nt* 'use,' that contrasts with another transitive stem *kʷul'-nt* 'make, fix.' The -*m* of *kʷul'-m-nt*, which I analyze as the weak allomorph of -*min*, is a suffix that attaches to bases forming extended bases ready for transitivization with -*nt*, -*st*,[15] -*ɫt*, -*tuɫt*. As I now understand the workings of -*min*, this is a derivational affix that attaches to certain bases, not to others. All such derived -*min* bases are lexical entries. I do not have a definition of -*min*, notional or otherwise.

First, some comments about the stress properties of -*m(í)n*.

3.2. Weak bases. The majority of -*min-nt* stems that contrast with simple -*nt* transitive stems, show a weak base[16] plus (stressed) -*mí(n)* plus -*nt*, forming a stem of the shape *base-mí(n)-nt*. First I give the simplest examples, where a base = root:

Weak base + -*nt*:   Weak base + -*mi(n)-nt*:
58.
a. c'q'ant   b. c'q'mint
   hit something (with fist)   throw away (rock or similar object)

c. səp'ánt   d. səp'mínt
   hit something (with stick)   throw away (a stick)

e. c'xʷant   f. c'xʷmint
   pour (liquid)   spill (liquid)

g. pkʷəntín   h. pkʷmínt[17]
   I poured it (solid) here   spill solids

---
[15]Together with *c*- this is the customary, not the causative. Cf. sections 3.5.1. and 3.9.

[16]As diagnostic I use bases comprised only of a root, otherwise the point is moot.

[17]These translations are the norm, but there is some uncertainty. Alongside examples 58g and h one finds *pəkʷmín* 'I spread it around (as seeds).'

i. irəntín   j. yrmint (iʔ lwakín)
   I coiled it   push (the wagon)

The *n* of -*min*, lost before all transitivizers, is restored in the -*nt*-less forms of the genitive paradigm, e.g.:

59. lut   akspəkʷmínəm ascq'ʷlíw'. MT
    lut   a-   ks-   pəkʷ+mín   -əm   ascq'ʷlíw'
    not   you fut   spill   intrans your_picking
    Don't spill your picking.

60. lut kʷu akspəkʷmíɫtəm iscq'ʷlíw'.
    Don't spill my berries.

3.3. Strong bases. There are many examples where -*m* is attached to a strong base–but few[18] of these contrast with simple (-*m*-less) transitive forms. The notable strong base with -*m* that contrasts with an -*m*-less transitive counterpart is *kʷul'*, already exemplified in 3.1. With strong bases, in other words, the normal case is that exemplified by *n+x̌il-m(in)*, *naqʷ-m(in)*:

61.
a. nx̌íl-m   b. nqʷ-m
   nx̌ílməntsən (*n+x̌il-nt)[19]   náq'ʷməntxʷ //naq'ʷ-min-nt-xʷ// (*naq'ʷ-nt)
   I got scared of you.   You stole it.

The best evidence that this -*m* is the stressless allomorph of -*m(í)n* (here and in the examples that follow) comes from intransitivized negative forms:

62.
a. lut kʷu aksənx̌ílmnəm.   b. lut kʷu aksənx̌ílmɫtəm isqʷsíʔ.
   Don't be scared of me.   Don't scared of my son.

c. lut aksnáq'ʷmnəm.   d. lut kʷu aksnáq'ʷəmɫtəm inkwáp.
   Don't steal it.   Don't steal my horse.

---
[18]If any. All such forms can be analyzed otherwise.

[19]See also examples 66m-r that share this base, and see footnote 21.

3.4. *-nt* transitive stems obligatorily with *-m(in)*. Aside from the strong bases just discussed, there are other verb bases (weak and strong) that do not attach the transitive suffixes *-nt* and *-tt* without first adding *-m/-min*. Here I give an example of a weak base:

63.

a. kən yaˤ·sqílxʷ.
I am shy, afraid of people.

b. kʷu yaˤ·míntəm.
They are skittish with/afraid of us.

c. yaˤ·míntsən uł lut t’ síwntsən.
I am afraid of you and I didn't ask you. McG.

d. lut kʷu aksyaˤ·mínəm. MT
Don't be afraid of me / shy with me.

Here, too, can be classed cases such as *xʷic’+x+m* 'give away,' on which the *-nt* transitive stem *xʷic’+x+m-nt* is formed. *-min* and *-nt* must co-occur. I note again that there is a base *xʷic’* which forms stems *xʷic’łt, xʷic’xt* (but not **xʷic’-nt*–see section 1.3.2.). *xʷic’+x+m*, then, is the base on which *-nt* (and *-tt* and *-tutt*) stems are formed, as in the following examples:

64.

a. xʷíc’xməntxʷ.
You gave it away.

b. kʷu xʷíc’xəmłts isqláw’.
He gave away my money.

c. kʷu xʷəc’xəmtútts iʔ sqláw’s.
He gave me her money.

I note here that the *-tt* stem has the regular reading of the direct object as possessor, and the *-tutt* stem, as expected, has *kʷu* as the indirect object. The approximate underlying representation of this base is //xʷíc’+xix+min//, with *-x* and *-m* the weak allomorphs of *-xix*[20] and *-min*, respectively.

3.5. *-st* causative stems with and without *-m(in)*.

3.5.1. *-st* causative stems obligatorily with *-m(in)*. Several causative stems obligatorily take *-m(in)*. Here is a set of root-stressed examples:

65.

a. p’úλ’əmstən.
I completed it.

b. táxʷəmstən.
I lowered it to him.

c. t’ít’i’ʔmstxʷ.
It's easy for you.

d. ʔasƛəmstxʷ.
You work with both.

---

[20]I leave the discussion of *-xix* for a future paper. The suffix occupies a slot that precedes *-min*, which, in turn, precedes one of the transitivizers. This seems to differ from the workings of its Cr. cognate.

I will return to the discussion of *-m-st* stems in the next section and in section 3.9.

3.5.2. Causative stems without *-m(in)*. There are bases that form causative stems attaching *-st* without *-m(in)*; but these same bases require *-m(in)* to form *-nt* and *-tt* stems:

66.

a. nxl (**nixl-nt*)
haʔ kʷ níxəlʔ McG
Have you heard the news?

b. nixl-m
haʔ níxəlməntxʷʔ McG.
Did you hear it?

c. ʔayx̌ʷ+t
kən ʔáyx̌ʷt.
I am tired.

d. ʔayx̌ʷ+t-m

e. ixfʔ ʔáyx̌ʷtstən. TD
I got him tired.

f. ixfʔ ʔáyx̌ʷtməntsən. TD
I am tired of you.

g. ʔáyx̌ʷtstən inkəwáp. McG
I got my horse tired.

h. lut kʷu aksʔáyx̌ʷtmnəm. TD
Don't get tired of me.

i. lm+t
kən limt
I am glad.

j. lm+t-m

k. límtstmən. McG
I made you glad.

l. límtməntsən. McG
I'm glad to see you.

m. n+x̌ił ~ n+x̌íl[21]
kən nx̌ił.
I am scared.

n. nx̌íl-m
nx̌íłmən.
I am scared of him.

o. nx̌íłstmən.
I scared you.

p. lut kʷu aksənx̌íłmnəm
Don't be afraid of me

q. nx̌íłstən iʔ sƛ’a’ʔcínəm.
I scared the deer.

r. lut kʷu aksənx̌íłmłtəm inkəkwáp
Don't be afraid of my dog

Sporadically speakers produce causatives with and without *-m* (alongside *-nt* transitives that require *-m*), as in the following examples:

---

[21]Note that for some speakers there is a stem *n+x̌il-nt*, and forms such as *nx̌íləntsən* 'I scared you,' and *nx̌íłən iʔ sƛ’a’ʔcínəm.* 'I scared the deer.' are grammatical. Other speakers reject them.

67.

a. ʔilx̌ʷt

b. ʔilx̌ʷt-m

c. ʔílx̌ʷtmən iʔ síyaʔ. TD
I am hungry for sask.

d. lut aksʔílx̌ʷtmnəm. TD
Don't get hungry for it.

e. ʔílx̌ʷtstmən
I made you hungry.

f. ʔílx̌ʷtəmstmən. JA
I made you hungry.

I should point out that all transitives with *-m(in)-nt* have regular customary forms in *c-...-m-st*, and these stems should not be construed as causative:

68.

a. cníxlməntsən.
I heard what you're saying.

b. cníxləmstmən.[22]
I hear you (customary).

c. yaʕ·míntsən.
I am afraid of you.

d. niʕʷíp kʷu cyaʕ·místs. MT
He's always afraid of me.

e. lut kʷu akstk'ítmnəm. MT (*k'it*, strong)[23]
Don't get near me.

f. niʕʷíp kʷu əctk'ítəmstxʷ. (*k'it*, strong)
You always get near me.

g. ixíʔ c'áyx̌ʷtəmstən.
I am tired of it.

One will have noticed that all the examples of *-m(in)-st* (not the customary forms just given) in this section are of strong stems. Were it not for their unexpected behavior with regard to stress, I could have included here examples such as the following:

---

[22]Translations of *-m-st* forms based on this root as 'hear about,' as opposed to translations of *-m-nt* forms as 'hear a person,' seem ill-guided attempts to translate 'talk about' as a single stem. Cf. the following, a better attempt to render the English 'I've heard about you' in Okanagan:

níxəlmənəlx ɬaʔ ctqʷəlqʷíltməntsəlx. (MT)
I heard them talk about you.

[23]Compare this and the next example with examples 79a-d.

69.

a. px̌ʷ+əm+stísəlx.
They passed it around (distributed it).
(px̌ʷax̌ʷ 'scattered'; *px̌ʷ-nt;
pəx̌ʷmín 'I scattered it.')

b. kʷu ixʷ+əm+stíxʷ.
You brought me down (lowered me).
(yax̌ʷt 'fallen'; *ixʷ-nt;
ixʷmín 'I dropped it.')

c. akstkxn+əm+stím.
You'll put it along with it.
(kxan 'go along'; *kxn-nt)

I will mention two possible analyses of these forms in section 3.9.

3.6. Mutual exclusivity of *-min* and *-xit*. The best evidence that *-min* and *-xit* are mutually exclusive comes from bases that show, alongside intransitive stems, transitive stems with and without *-min*. *t'ʕap* 'shoot a target,' and *t'ʕap+mín* 'shoot a weapon' are such bases:

70.   kən t'ʔapám iʔ t sƛ'a'cínəm. MT
I killed a (single) deer.

71.

a. t'ʕapəntín.
I shot (the target)

b. t'ʕapmín.
I shot (the weapon)

c. kím'ən isl'áx̌t, kiʔ t'ʕapɬtín iʔ kwaps.
I got mad at my partner and I shot his horse.

d. t'ʕapmíɬtsən asululmínk.
I shot your gun (gun is the target).

e. kʷu t'ʕapxíts iʔ t sƛ'a'cínəm. MT
He shot a deer for me.

f. *t'ʕapmxít

g. niʕʷíp əct'ʕapstís iʔ x̌ax̌ʔúlaʔxʷ.
He always shoots rattlesnakes. MT

h. niʕʷíp əct'ʕapmísts iʔ sululmínk.
He always shoots a gun. MT

i. niʕʷíp kʷu ct'ʕat'ʕapmíɬts isululmínk.
He always shoots my gun. MT

This last example shows a customary form with *-ɬt* (a regular construction). But I should add that the form is found to be less felicitous[24] than one based on the stem *t'ʕap+ɬkst-m(in)*:

72.   niʕʷíp kʷu ct'ʕat'ʕapɬkstəmíɬts isululmínk.
He always shoots around with my gun. MT

---

[24]At least by MT.

(cf. *kən_t* *ʷatʼaˁpíkstəm.* 'I did some shooting around.' MT, etc.).

3.7. More on the workings of *-min*. From the examples given thus far (and others), I cannot assign a gloss to *-min* that does justice to its function. And there are examples of stems that come in pairs (with and without *-min*) without apparent difference in meaning:

73.

a. ƛ'aʔƛ'aʔánt
look for it

b. ƛ'aʔƛ'aʔmínt
go look for it

c. k'ʷƛ'ntis
he took it off

d. k'ʷƛ'mis
he took it off

e. ƛ'uʔwntís
he put out the light

f. ƛ'uʔwmís
he put out the light

g. səq'ntís
he split it

h. səq'mís
he split it

i. axáʔ laˁ'ntíxʷ.
Here, you put this on.

j. axáʔ laˁ'míntxʷ.
Here, you put this on.

k. txəlkəntín
I went around it

l. txəlkəmín
I went around it

I have not systematically tried to verify the semantics of all these stems, but in the course of the discussion of these matters, speakers have produced occasional examples that show a contrast between two stems, such as the following, based on *t+xlk*:

74. txəlkəntín iʔ təmxʷúlaʔxʷ.
I went around the world.

75. lut t' inx̌mínk ł ikswíkəm, uł txəlkəmín.
I didn't want to see him, that's why I went around him. McG.

3.8. Other peculiarities of *-min* bases. Not unlike other forms, *-min* bases show peculiarities and idiosyncracies. Here I give several examples.

3.8.1. *-min* transitivized with either *-nt* or *-st*. *-min* added to √*sw's(t)* derives a base that can be transitivized with either *-nt* or *-st*, and this matches the fact that there are two imperatives of √*sw's(t)*, each typical of the *-nt* and *-st* stems, respectively:

76. sw'st (intr)
kən_ksíw'staʔx.
I'm going to drink.

77.

a. sw's-nt (trans)
síw'sənt axáʔ.
Drink this!

b. sw's-st (trans)
siw'skʷ axáʔ.
Drink this!

c. sw's-ł
kʷu síw'słtxʷ
You drank mine.

d. sw'st+m-st
kʷu síw'stəmstxʷ. McG
Give me a drink.

e. siw'st+mn-nt
kʷu síw'stməntxʷ.
You gave me a drink.

f. siw'st+m(n)-st
kʷu síw'stəmstxʷ.
You gave me a drink.

g. lut kʷu aksíw'stmnəm. McG
Don't give me a drink.

h. lut kʷu aksíw'stəmstam ixíʔ. McG
Don't give me a drink (of that).

i. ha kʷu aksíw'stmnəm? McG
Are you going to give me a drink?

j. ha kʷu aksíw'stəmstam? McG
Are you going to give me a drink?

3.8.2. *-min* bases built on a root with competing stress valence. Not unique to √*k't* is the occurrence of bases of different valences:

78. √k't 'near'

79.

a. k'ík'aʔt
It's near.

b. k'aʔtmínt. (*k'aʔt,* weak)
Get near to it!

c. lut kʷu aksk'aʔtmínəm. (*k'aʔt,* weak)
Don't get near me.

d. lut kʷu akstk'ítmnəm. MT (*k'it,* strong)
Don't get near me.

3.8.3. *-min* bases with extra material. Here I give some sets of examples of bases that, in addition to *-min*, contain other morphological material.[25] My aim is to highlight the importance of the stem, and *-min*, contain other morphological material. My aim is to highlight the importance of the stem, and

---

[25]This section is an aside about the centrality of the *stem*, and the relative unimportance of the *root*. Some time ago, in addition to using hyphens (-) and double hyphens (=), I began using plus signs (+) to mark different kinds of morpheme boundaries in interlinear analyzed text. This subject deserves a formal treatment, so I give some examples as an invitation for discussion.

to promote an analysis of words into stems and inflectional affixes, in preference to a linear[26] morphological segmentation of words.

Both the bases *málx̌aʔ* 'lie to someone,' and *k+málx̌aʔ* 'lie about something/somebody,' where the derivational prefix *k-* carries the difference in meaning reflected in the glosses, take *-min* only in certain paradigms.

Besides the intransitive

80.   kənˌmálx̌aʔ
        I lied

there are transitive forms

81.
a. kʷu málx̌aʔs.
    He lied to me.

b. kʷu k+málx̌aʔ-s.
    He lied about me.

c. niˤʔíp kʷu cmálx̌aʔsts. RA
    He always lies to me.

d. niˤʔíp kʷu ckmálx̌aʔsts.
    He always lies about me.

e. məl·x̌aʔnún. RA
    I accidentally lied to him.

I have found no forms *kʷu (k+)málx̌aʔ-m-s* (or other *-m(in)* + transitivizer) yet there are negative forms

82.
a. lut kʷu aksmálx̌aʔam. McG
    Don't lie to me.

b. lut kʷu akskmálx̌aʔam.
    Don't lie about me. RA

c. lut akskmálx̌aʔmnəm. MT[27]
    Don't lie about it.

d. lut kʷu akskmálx̌aʔmnəm. MT
    Don't lie about me.

e. lut aksmálx̌aʔm aslʔáx̌t. MT, RA
    Don't lie to him.

f. lut akskmál·x̌aʔmnəm aslʔáx̌t[28] McG
    Don't lie about your partner.

---

[26]By which I mean an analysis that breaks up the form morpheme by morpheme, without consideration for the stem as a significant unit of word formation.

[27]This and the next three examples parallel the examples discussed in footnote 14.

[28]Why there should be a long *l* in this form, I don't know.

Not unexpectedly forms with and without *m* compete in the *-ł* paradigm:

83.   lut kʷu akskmálx̌aʔ(m)łtəm isqʷsfʔ. RA
        Don't lie about my son.

The stem *ł+qʷəlqʷílt+mn-nt* 'talk about someone/something,' like *k+málx̌aʔ*, shows in its bases a *k-*[29] prefix that added to verb bases derives stems the meanings of which (in spite of these two examples) are not recoverable from those of the base. Like *málx̌aʔ-nt*, there is a *k*-less stem *qʷəlqʷíl-st* 'talk to someone.' But whereas *(k+)málx̌aʔ* shows the peculiarities I have outlined, *qʷəlqʷíl-st* and *ł+qʷəlqʷílt+mn-nt*, aside from the different allomorphs, are regular in all respects:

84.   kənˌqʷəlqʷílt taˌnqfílxʷcən.
        I talk the Indian language.

85.
a. qʷəlqʷíltmən. MT
    I talked to you.

b. łqʷəlqʷíltməntsən. MT
    I talked about you.

c. taʔlfʔ x̌ast caʔkʷ łqʷəlqʷíltməntxʷ.
    It's good that you should talk about it.

The bases *xʷist-mn* and *ł-xʷist-mn* (again involving the prefix *k-*) are sometimes translated differently, but in practice are often used interchangeably:

86.   kənˌxʷist.
        I walk, travel

87.
a. xʷístməntxʷ.
    You walk the land.

b. łxʷístməntxʷ.
    You pace the area off.

c. łxʷístmənt aslʔáx̌t, mi tqəntíxʷ.
    Walk to your partner and touch him.

d. lut kʷu akstxʷístəmłtəm isqʷsfʔ.[30] RA
    Don't walk up to my son.

---

[29]I consider *ł-* an allomorph of *k-* that occurs before bases that begin with (post)velars.

[30]I also have a form *lut kʷu akstxʷístəmnəmłtəm isqʷsfʔ*, also given by RA, but I discount it as the product of too much coffee, too late in the afternoon, after too much paradigmatic eliciting.

The suffix -míst[31] is part of bases that can further derive -mín stems. Consider the base tiw 'buy something' and the base tw+mist 'sell something.' Here, and in similar cases, the internal structure of the base is irrelevant–it plus -mín form the stem that -mín heads. tiw is the base for a simple -nt transitive stem as:

88. tíwəntxʷ
     tiw-nt-∅-xʷ
     buy-nt-it-you
     You bought it.

tiw plus -mist forms the base tw+mist, which, by itself, is an intransitive stem, as in

89. tumístx t akɫtq'ʷˀʔáy'.
     tu+míst -x   t   a-   kɫ-   t+q'ʷˀʔáy'.
     buy   intr_imptv t   your fut   gum
     Buy some gum!

tw+míst (a strong base that retains the stressed vowel) plus -min form the base for a transitive stem like tw+mist-m(ín)-nt:

90. tumístməntxʷ
     tw+míst -m(n) -nt -∅ -xʷ
     sell   -mín   -nt -∅ -xʷ
     sell   -m(n) -nt -it -you
     You sold it.

Here is the same stem c-tw+mist+mn-st in the customary aspect (əc-...-st):

---

[31]The question of whether or not -míst historically is *-min-st (where -st is a vowelless allomorph of *-cút/-sút 'reflexive'), does not bear on the synchronic analysis. Nor should these forms be analyzed synchronically, as consisting of a root plus sequences of affixes, without restriction for repeated occurrences of the same affix in a single word. In Okanagan, for example, there is a suffix -st that can be connected with -cút 'reflexive.' See, for example, kən_kʷ'aʔkʷúl'st 'I practiced;' kən_kʷ'al'cəncút 'I cooked;' kʷ'l'əncútən 'creator,' all including the root √kʷ'l'. A linear analysis of the forms would not account, among other things, for the stress properties of the reflexive -st / -cút. Forms such as these abound, and they call for an analysis that proceeds from base to stem to word (in preference to a linear segmentation of morphemes).

---

91. əctumístəmstsəlx
     əc-   tw+míst   -m(n) -st -∅ -s   -lx
     cust sell   -m(n) -st -it -3rd -pl
     They sell it.

Consider also the following constructions based on the root √k'aˀ

92. kən_k'aˀm
     kən   k'aˀ -m
     I   pray middle
     I pray.

93.
a. k'ˀamístməntsən.
    k'ˀa+míst   -m(n) -nt -s -n
    hire   -min   -nt you I
    I hired you.

b. lut aksk'aˀmístmnəm.
    lut a-   ks-   k'ˀa+míst -mn-m
    not your fut   hire   -mnintr
    Don't hire him.

94. lut kʷu aksk'ˀamístəmɫtəm isqʷsíʔ. RA
     lut   kʷu a-   ks-   k'ˀa+míst -mn -ɫt -əm   isqʷsíʔ
     not   me your fut   hire   -mn -ɫt intr my_son
     Don't hire my son.

The root siw 'ask' is found in many stems, from the simplest intransitive ones, to some with considerable morphological material.

95.
a. intransitive stem siw-m 'ask'
    lut aksíwm.
    Don't ask.

b. transitive stem siw-nt 'ask someone'
    síwəntxʷ
    You asked him.

c. lut kʷu aksəcsíwm. RA
    Don't be asking me.

d. kʷu síwəntəm.
    He/they asked us.

e. intransitive stem sw-ɫtiɫn 'ask info.'
    kən suɫtíɫn
    I inquired.

f. transitive stem k'ɫ-siw-nt 'ask about someone'
    k'əɫsíwən pit.
    I asked about Pete.

g. kən ksuɫtíɫnaʔx.
    I'm going to ask around. RA

h. intransitive stem *k-sĭw-pla?* 'ask about'
   kən ksĭwpla?m t iktcĭtxʷ.
   I inquired if there would be a house for me.

i. transitive stem *k-sĭw-pla?-nt* 'ask for something/someone'
   kʷu ksĭwpla?s.
   He asked for me.

j. intransitive stem *ksupla?mĭst* 'ask for one's own benefit'
   kən ksupla?mĭst t iktcĭtxʷ.
   I asked if there would be a house for me.

k. transitive stem *sw+pla?+mĭst+mən-nt*
   xʷuyx mi ksupla?mĭstməntxʷ.
   Go ask him.

l. kʷu k-su-pla?-mĭst-mn-(n)t-əm
   They asked us a special permission.

m. lut kʷu aksksupla?mĭstmnəm.
   Don't ask me for directions.

n. intransitive stem *n+sw+cn+mist* 'propose'
   kən n+su+cn+mĭst.
   I proposed.

o. way' t'əxʷ lut iksənsucənmĭst, aɬ? way' t'i kʷu lutstsəlx.
   I am not going to propose, because they will turn me down,

p. transitive stem *n+sw+cn+mist+mn+nt* 'propose to someone'
   kʷu n-su-cn-mĭst-mən-(n)t-xʷ
   You proposed to me.

In sum, the use of the symbol + aims to avoid the irrelevance of the internal make up of the base, which would be even more cluttered were *-mist* and the transitivizers to be segmented further.

3.9. *-mĭn* or *-m*. Recall the problem presented by sets of forms like 69a-c and the following:

96.

a. lk'-nt 'tie something'
   kʷu lək'əntĭs.
   He tied me.

b. lk'+m-st
   kʷu lək'əmstĭs.
   He forced me.

The problem is that *lk'* (and the bases of 69a-c) are weak. *-min* attached to a weak base should result in a form *base+mĭn* (where the stress in on *-mĭn*). These stems with ...*m-st-ĭ*... are weak, however. One could either analyze them as containing an *-m* (of indeterminate *-min*-like function), or explore the possibility that the sequence *weak_base+min* derives a (weak) base that, in the causative paradigm only, loses its stress to the subject referents. This is a proposal that, provided one finds historical evidence to suggest that an earlier suffix **-stV* is a strong suffix, and that Ok *-st* has retained the slot for the stressed vowel, is not as unlikely as might at first seem. This, too, will have to be discussed some other time.

References

Carlson, B. F. 1993. Situation aspect and a Spokane control morpheme. ms.

Egesdal, S. M. 1993. A brief response to Thomason and Everett's *Transitivity in Flathead*. 28th ICSL.

Mattina, A. 1993. Okanagan aspect: a working paper. 28th ICSL preprints pp. 233-63. Seattle.

Mattina, N. 1993. Some lexical properties of Colville-Okanagan ditransitives. 28th ICSL preprints pp. 265-284. Seattle.

----. 1994. Roots, bases, and stems in Colville-Okanagan. 29th ICSL preprints.

Thomason, S. and D. Everett. 1993. Transitivity in Flathead. 28th ICSL preprints pp. 317-343. Seattle.